



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/015,316	12/12/2001	John Hufferd	IL920000089US2	2909

7590 11/24/2006  
IBM CORPORATION  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW DEPT.  
P.O. BOX 218  
YORKTOWN HEIGHTS, NY 10598

EXAMINER

AHMED, SALMAN

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2616

DATE MAILED: 11/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

57

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>		<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/015,316		HUFFERD ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>		<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Salman Ahmed		2616	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/9/2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12/12/2001, 2/8/2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

**DETAILED ACTION**

Claims 1-8 are pending.

Claims 1-8 are rejected.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

2. Claims 1, 2 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sapuntzakis et al. (hereinafter referred to as Sapuntzakis) IETF draft TCP RDMA option draft-csapuntz-tcprdma-00.txt, Cisco Systems February 2000, in view of Brustoloni et al. (US PAT 6886103), hereinafter referred to as Brustoloni

In regards to claims 1 and 6, Sapuntzakis teaches a method/system/computer for transporting/receiving/transmitting data packets/ a multiplicity of data packets /data stream over a network the method comprising the steps of: attaching a data packet header to a data packet by a first transmitting processor, data packet header comprising: an internet protocol (IP) header; a remote direct memory access (RDMA) header; and a transmission control protocol (TCP) header; and transporting said data packets over network and receiving processor for receiving the data packets/ a multiplicity of data packets /data stream (Page 3, Introduction, page 4 lines 2-5 and page 5 section 3.1.2) the sender places the option on TCP segments containing RDMA data. The RDMA option describes to the receiver the location of the RDMA data in the TCP payload. Currently, doing remote DMA (RDMA) between processors over TCP protocols such as HTTP and NFS requires much processing on the client and server machines, especially at speeds of a gigabit or higher. The data offset specifies the number of bytes from the beginning of the TCP payload to the RDMA transfer data).

Sapuntzakis does not explicitly teach that RDMA header can be inserted between associated TCP and associated IP headers.

Brustoloni in the same field of endeavor teaches a data packet header (figure 2) comprising: an internet protocol (IP) header (figure 2, IP header), and a transmission control protocol (TCP) header (figure 2, TCP header), and IPsec defined protocols like the AH (Authentication Header) protocol (figure 2 element 202) and the ESP (Encapsulating Security Payload) protocol (figure 3 element 302) header inserted between TCP and IP header and transported using TCP/IP.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Sapuntzakis' system/method of transporting RDMA related header via TCP with Brustoloni's system/method of putting additional data headers between IP and TCP. The motivation is that putting RDMA header between TCP and IP headers will enable a process to get to RDMA related information quickly and efficiently without decoding TCP header; thus making the network to process information faster.

In regards to claim 2, Sapuntzakis teaches (page 13, section 3.2.1, lines 1-5) on an HTTP/1.1 connection, the server sends back responses in the order it received requests. Thus, the index of the request, where the first request is index 0, is sufficient to disambiguate the RDMA's.

3. Claims 3-5, 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sapuntzakis et al. (hereinafter referred to as Sapuntzakis) IETF draft TCP RDMA option draft-csapuntz-tcprdma-00.txt, Cisco Systems February 2000, in view of Brustoloni et al. (US PAT 6886103), hereinafter referred to as Brustoloni and further in view of Tsunoda (US PAT 6516435).

In regards to claims 3-5, 7 and 8, Sapuntzakis teaches a method/system/computer for transporting/receiving/transmitting data packets/ a multiplicity of data packets /data stream over a network the method comprising the steps of: attaching a data packet header to a data packet by a first transmitting processor, data packet header comprising: an internet protocol (IP) header; a remote

direct memory access (RDMA) header; and a transmission control protocol (TCP) header; and transporting said data packets over network and receiving processor for receiving the data packets/ a multiplicity of data packets /data stream (Page 3, Introduction, page 4 lines 2-5 and page 5 section 3.1.2) the sender places the option on TCP segments containing RDMA data. The RDMA option describes to the receiver the location of the RDMA data in the TCP payload. Currently, doing remote DMA (RDMA) between processors over TCP protocols such as HTTP and NFS requires much processing on the client and server machines, especially at speeds of a gigabit or higher. The data offset specifies the number of bytes from the beginning of the TCP payload to the RDMA transfer data).

Sapuntzakis does not explicitly teach that RDMA header can be inserted

Between associated TCP and associated IP headers.

Brustoloni teaches a data packet header (figure 2) comprising: an internet protocol (IP) header (figure 2, IP header), and a transmission control protocol (TCP) header (figure 2, TCP header), and IPSec defined protocols like the AH (Authentication Header) protocol (figure 2 element 202) and the ESP (Encapsulating Security Payload) protocol (figure 3 element 302) header inserted between TCP and IP header and transported using TCP/IP.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Sapuntzakis' system/method of transporting RDMA related header via TCP with Brustoloni's system/method of putting additional data headers between IP and TCP. The motivation is that putting RDMA header between

TCP and IP headers will enable a process to get to RDMA related information quickly and efficiently without decoding TCP header; thus making the network to process information faster.

In regards to claims 3, 4, 5, 7 and 8 Sapuntzakis and Brustoloni teach sending RDMA header in between IP and TCP headers as described above.

In regards to claims 3, 4, 5, 7 and 8 Sapuntzakis and Brustoloni do not explicitly teach at least two of the data packets contain the TCP, IP and RDMA headers and at least two of data packets is each data packet in the stream.

Tsunoda in the same field of endeavor teaches sending redundant (column 21 lines 40-41, m pieces of information packets and the k pieces of redundant packets are transmitted) packets.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Sapuntzakis and Brustoloni's system/method by incorporating the step of sending redundant packets as taught by Tsunoda. The motivation is that (as taught by Tsunoda, column 3 lines 27-30) Tsundoa's teaching provides an error correction scheme, which can produce redundant packets; thus making the network reliable.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments see pages 2-3 of the Remarks section, filed 11/9/2006, with respect to the rejections of claims 1-8 have been fully considered and are not persuasive.

In regards to claim 1, Applicant argues (see page 2 paragraph 4) the information carried by Brustoloni et al.'s additional data headers is stack information, not application information. There is no suggestion, or even inclination, in the generally available knowledge, available either in 2000 or the year of the filing of the references, or in Sapuntzakis et al. or even in Brustoloni et al., to put application information below the TCP. However, Examiner respectfully disagrees with the assertion.

The test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. See *In re Keller* 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

Rigid prophylactic test is not needed to implement Section 103(a)'s nonobviousness requirement. Teaching-Suggestion-Motivation Test Should Not Be The Exclusive Means Of Establishing Obviousness. There may be differences between respondent's invention and the state of the prior art. The gap between the prior art and respondent's system is simply not so great as to render the system nonobvious to one reasonably skilled in the art." *Id.* at 230. (No. 04-1350 *In the Supreme Court of the United States KSR INTERNATIONAL CO., PETITIONER v. TELEFLEX INC., ET AL.*). As such putting application information below the TCP would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.



Applicant argues (see page 2 paragraph 5) that to state a motivation of enabling the application to get "the information quickly and efficiently", and thus putting it below the TCP, is with all due respect, hindsight, since in the days of Sapuntzakis et al. and Brustoloni et al. no one put application information below the TCP, no one foresaw it and no one would even think of it. If they had thought to put application information below the TCP, they would have done so, and not waited until the applicants' invention to do so. Again, the Examiner respectfully disagrees with the assertion for the same reasons cited above.

Applicant argues (see page 2 paragraph 6) that to put the RDMA used by the application below the stack, below the TCP, was against the known methodology, and with due respect, it is hindsight to think of implementing such a function. Known methodology did not put information needed by the application below the TCP. However Examiner respectfully disagrees with the assertion. As mention earlier The test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. See *In re Keller* 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981). Rigid prophylactic test is not needed to implement Section 103(a)'s nonobviousness requirement. Teaching-Suggestion-Motivation Test Should Not Be The Exclusive Means Of Establishing Obviousness. There may be differences between respondent's invention and the state of the prior art. The gap

Art Unit: 2616

between the prior art and respondent's system is simply not so great as to render the system nonobvious to one reasonably skilled in the art." Id. at 230. (No. 04-1350 In the Supreme Court of the United States KSR INTERNATIONAL CO., PETITIONER v. TELEFLEX INC., ET AL). As such putting application information below the TCP would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

Applicant's argument in regards to claims 2 and 6 are not persuasive for the same reasons cited above.

In regards to claims 3-5, 7 and 8 Applicant argues (see page 3 paragraph 5) that known methodology did not put information needed by the application below the TCP. There is no suggestion in the generally available knowledge, available either in 2000 or before this present application, or in Sapuntzakis et al. or in Brustoloni et al. or even in Tsunoda, to put application information below the TCP. To state a motivation of enabling the application to get "the information quickly and efficiently", and thus putting it below the TCP, is with all due respect, hindsight. No one put application information below the TCP, and no one would even think of it - unless they had been shown it before, and said "wow, why didn't I think of that, it is a great idea" - but this is hindsight. Thus, with due respect, the Examiner has not established a prima facie case of obviousness.

However Examiner respectfully disagrees with the assertion for the reasons cited above.

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

#### ***Conclusion***

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Salman Ahmed whose telephone number is (571)272-8307. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am - 5:00 pm.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hassan Kizou can be reached on (571) 272-3088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2616

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Art Unit 2616

SA



HASSAN KIZOW  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600